

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed January 23, 2008, claims 1 – 18 were rejected. Additionally, claims 19 – 22 were withdrawn in response to a Restriction requirement. In response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 3 – 7, and 10 – 18 and canceled claims 2, 8, and 9. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the amended claims and the below-provided remarks.

### Response to Claim Rejections

Claims 1 – 7, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hughes et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,184,767, hereinafter Hughes). Additionally, claims 8 – 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes in view of Washington (U.S. Pat. No. 6,031,613). However, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable over Hughes and Washington for the reasons provided below.

#### Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to particularly point out that “at least two EM beams” are provided with the at least two beams “being provided from two different EM sources.” Support for this amendment is found in Applicants’ specification at, for example, Fig. 1. Claim 1 has also been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 2. Claim 2 has been canceled. As amended, claim 1 recites:

“A method for determining the position of an object, comprising:  
    providing ***at least two*** electromagnetic (EM) beams, said at least two EM beams being provided from ***two different EM sources***;  
    dispersing said at least two EM beams, respectively, into a scanning space by frequency;  
    retro-reflecting at least a portion of said respective dispersed beams off an object positioned within said scanning space; and  
    determining, in response to frequencies associated with said retro-reflecting beams, respective angular positions of said object;  
    ***triangulating*** coordinates of said object ***using two or more*** of said respective angular positions.” (emphasis added)

As recited in claim 1, the method for position determination utilizes at least two EM beams from two different EM sources to determine angular positions and then triangulates coordinates of the object using the two or more angular positions.

Applicants assert that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Hughes because Hughes does not disclose a method for determining position that uses at least two EM beams from two different EM sources to determine angular positions of an object and that triangulates coordinates using the angular positions as recited in claim 1. In contrast to claim 1, Hughes discloses an optical radar system that includes only one EM source. Specifically, Hughes discloses laser source (10) in Fig. 1 as the one EM source. Because Hughes discloses only laser source (10), Hughes does not disclose triangulating coordinates using two or more of the angular positions that are generated using at least two EM beams from at least two EM sources.

#### Independent Claim 7

Independent claim 7 has been amended to include similar limitations to claim 1. In particular, claim 7 has been amended to recite “at least two EM sources,” “at least two beam dispersion devices,” and “at least two receptors.” Support for this amendment is found in Applicants’ specification at, for example, Fig. 1. Claim 7 has also been amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 8 and 9. Claims 8 and 9 are cancelled.

Applicants assert that Hughes does not disclose “at least two EM sources,” “at least two beam dispersion devices,” and “at least two receptors” as recited in amended claim 7. In contrast to claim 7, Hughes discloses an optical radar system that includes only one EM source (laser source (10) in Fig. 1), one dispersion device (dispersing element (16) in Fig. 2), and one receptor (detection system (60) in Fig. 1). Because Hughes discloses only one laser source (10), one dispersing element (16), and one receptor (60), Hughes does not disclose “at least two EM sources,” “at least two beam dispersion devices,” and “at least two receptors” as recited in amended claim 7.

Dependent Claims 3 – 6 and 10 – 18

Claims 3 – 6 are dependent on claim 1 and claims 10 – 18 are dependent on claim 7. Applicants respectfully assert that claims 2 – 6 and 8 – 18 are allowable at least based on allowable base claims. Claims 4, 5, 6, 10, and 12 – 18 have been amended to coincide with the amendments to claims 1 and 7, respectively. Applicants assert that the limitations of at least two EM beams, at least two EM sources, at least two beam dispersion devices, at least two receptors, and at least two polarization state rotators are not taught by Hughes or Washington.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-3718** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-3718** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: April 18, 2008

Mark A. Wilson  
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham  
PMB: 348  
2530 Berryessa Road  
San Jose, CA 95132  
Phone: (925) 249-1300  
Fax: (925) 249-0111